



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,668	09/13/2001	Jack Thacher Leonard	MCA-448 PC/US	8911
25182	7590	08/19/2004	EXAMINER	
MILLIPORE CORPORATION 290 CONCORD ROAD BILLERICA, MA 01821			KIM, SUN U	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1723

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/936,668	LEONARD, JACK THACHER	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John Kim	1723	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2004.
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20,22-28 and 30-34 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4,6,11-14,16,18 and 22 is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,7-10,15,17,19,20,23-28 and 30-34 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 September 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1723

1. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-10, 15, 17, 19-20, 23-28 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,223,133 (hereinafter referred to as Clark et al '133) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,948,564 (hereinafter referred to as Root et al). Clark et al '133 teach a process for concentration of nucleic acids comprising the steps of providing ultrafiltration membrane (15) having a molecular cutoff between 1 00 D and 2000 kD and made of polysulfone in 25 multiple wells (11), processing a volume of up to 400 microliters i.e. 0 to 400 microliters of sample, subjecting the sample on the membrane to vacuum (5) till nucleic acids are concentrated on the membrane (see figures 1-3, 6-7; col. 3, lines 15-18; col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 36; col. 5, lines 28-61). Claims 1, 8, 10, 15, 17, 19-20, 23-24, 27-28 and 32-34 essentially differ from the method of Clark et al '133 in reciting the step of applying a constant pressure differential. Clark et al '133 teaches that vacuum chamber (2) is connected to a regulated external vacuum source to apply vacuum to wells (11) through membrane (15) (see col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 11). Root et al teach the use of a valve (100) adjacent a vacuum passage to provide even pressure control across the filter membrane to avoid splattering of filtrate in vacuum chamber (70)(see figures 5-6; col. 6, lines 17-31). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply a constant pressure differential to wells via a valve adjacent a vacuum passage to avoid splattering of filtrate in vacuum chamber of Clark et al '133. Regarding claims 3, 25-26, and 30, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to regulate pressure differential from 169 millibars to about 914 millibars to the wells of Clark et al '133 to obtain desired rate of ultrafiltration. Regarding claim 5, Root et al teach a positive pressure applied by a syringe (see col. 7, line 59 – col. 8, line 27). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 1723

invention was made to apply positive pressure from about 5 psi to about 80 psi to the wells of Clark et al '133 to obtain desired rate of ultrafiltration. Regarding claim 7, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a single well device to process a single sample. Regarding claims 9 and 31, Root et al teach that 96 well plate is widely used (see col. 1, lines 29-32). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a well-known 96-well filtration plate in the method of Clark et al '133 for concentrating nucleic acids.

2. Claims 2, 4, 6, 11-14, 16, 18 and 22 are allowed.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20, 2228 and 30-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1723

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-1142. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda Walker, can be reached on (571) 272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


John Kim
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1723

J. Kim
August 17, 2004